UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,205	12/02/2003	Bridget Mary Pantaleo	67389-034	4686

20277   7590   04/12/2007
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER
STERRETT, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/725,205	PANTALEO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan G. Sterrett	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a **Non-Final Office Action** in response to the applicant's

arguments filed December 29, 2006. Claims 1-56 are pending. It is noted that a new

examiner is handling this application as of March 29, 2007, Jonathan G Sterrett.

Response to Arguments

2.   The arguments regarding the 112 1st rejection are persuasive and the 112 1st

rejection is withdrawn. However, the applicant's remaining arguments have been fully

considered but are not persuasive.

3.   The applicant argues on page 16 and page 17 that Clarke (US 2006/0053043)

does not have support in the prior application, 09/837807, because the prior application

fails to contain appropriate support for a "financial institution".

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The examiner notes that an applicant wishing to rely upon a definition in the

specification must set out definitions in the specification with "clarity, deliberateness and

precision"[1]. The language surrounding "financial institution" is exemplary, and not

definitive as such (note para 24 in the specification: "such as a clearing house" – this

language fails to meet the standard for definitions in the specification).

Thus the examiner turns to the dictionary, specifically Webster's Collegiate

Dictionary, 10th edition, for a definition of what a financial institution is. Financial is

defined as "of or relating to finance" – "finance" is also defined as "money or other liquid resources of a business". An institution is defined as "an established organization". Since Clarke in the 807 reference is accounting for and optimizing personnel labor-hours (see column 9 line 30-35 of US 7171375 –issued from 09/837807), this relates to the liquid resources of an organization, since it affects the degree to which labor-hours and thus dollar cost is minimized by effective scheduling. Since the manufacturing organization discussed in the 807 reference has activities that relate to liquid resources (i.e. money), then the organization in 807 is as much a "financial institution" as is termed in the claims.

4.   The applicant argues that the term "financial institution" is functional language because it breathes life into the claims.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The term "financial institution" as used in the claims is in fact non-functional descriptive material. This term does not affect the structural limitations of the remainder of the claims, i.e. the tasks and subtasks as claimed, do not distinguish between whether the tasks and subtasks are those of a financial institution, a medical institution or any other type of institution. Thus, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements

---

[1] "The patentee's lexicography must, of course, appear 'with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision' before

remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not

distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re*

Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32

F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claim 1-2, 5, 22-23, 26 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Clarke (US 2006/0053043).

As per claims 1, 22 and 41, Clarke teaches receiving a plurality of tasks

(paragraph 8, where the system can be used for receiving a plurality of tasks and the

work breakdown structure records all tasks and subtasks related to the project.);

identifying a plurality of subtasks associated with each of the plurality of received tasks,

wherein the identified subtasks are of different types and are needed to perform each

respective task (paragraph 74 elaborates further as to the use of subtasks which

represent the "logical steps that must be performed to finish the job"); accessing

production rate information related to the amount of time (paragraph 88, where Clarke

teaches it is difficult to improve productivity if you cannot measure it, wherein the

---

it can affect the claim." *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni*, 158 F.3d 1243, 1249, 48 USPQ2d 1117,

system tracks productivity as it measures project efficiency, as indicated in paragraph 72. In order to measure project efficiency, the production rate would need to be determined), and calculating a work volume based on the identified subtasks and the production rate information (paragraph 85, where the system focuses on improving a combination of maintenance operation volume management and resource management to improve the facility, whereby improving volume management would require knowing the work volume).

Clarke teaches task management in a manufacturing organization. Clarke does not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims 1, 22 and 41; however, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP ϶ 2106.

However, Official Notice is taken that task management is utilized in the nonfunctional data (i.e. financial institutions) since it is known to improve the management of the operation of an organization.

1121 (Fed. Cir. 1998) citing In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1674 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings

of Clarke, to include the step of providing task management to a financial institution,

because it would improve the operational efficiency of the organizations.

The examiner notes that the term "financial institution" is non-functional

descriptive material and does not add patentable weight to the claim (see In re Gulack,

703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579,

32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106.)

As per claims 2, 23 and 42, Clarke teaches the production rate information

includes the amount of time needed to perform respective identified subtasks (See

Figure 6 which graphs all tasks with respect to time, as per the X axis and see also

paragraph 31 where it states that projects are typically constrained by time and

resources.).

As per claims 5 and 26, Clarke teaches the production rate information is

obtained from a database or by observation (paragraph 88, where Clarke teaches it is

difficult to improve productivity if you cannot measure it, wherein the system tracks

productivity as it measures project efficiency, as indicated in paragraph 72. In order to

measure project efficiency, the production rate would need to be determined and

paragraph 39 indicates that all the project management information is stored in a

database.).

6.   Claims 3, 6-7, 9-12, 15, 20-21, 24, 27-28, 30-34, 37, 39-40, 43, 45-50, 53, and

55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke (US

2006/0053043) in view of Morgan et al (US 5,799,286).

As per claims 3, 24 and 43, Clarke teaches the production rate information

(paragraph 88, where Clarke teaches it is difficult to improve productivity if you cannot

measure it, wherein the system tracks productivity as it measures project efficiency, as

indicated in paragraph 72. In order to measure project efficiency, the production rate

would need to be determined). Clarke does not explicitly teach production rate includes

the number of each identified subtasks that can be performed per one time. Morgan

teaches that it is known that production rate includes the number of each identified

subtasks that can be performed per one time (column 2, lines 43-45, which teaches

each activity is determined with respect to a percentage of time and column 4, lines 64-

67, where reports plot dimensional aspects with respect to time.). Morgan is an

analogous art as it also teaches about project management and workflow concerning

tasks. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the management system of Clarke with the number of

subtasks/time feature of Morgan to provide a means of measuring the rate of task

performance which can be targeted for reduction to help improve efficiency.

As per claims 6, 15, 27, 37, 45 and 53, Clarke teaches the work volume is

calculated (paragraph 85, where the system focuses on improving a combination of

maintenance operation volume management and resource management to improve the

facility, whereby improving volume management would require knowing the work

volume). Clarke does not explicitly teach work volume being calculated as the number of time units needed to perform the identified subtasks. Morgan teaches that it is known that work volume is calculated as the number of time units needed to perform the identified subtasks (column 6, lines 17-19, where the time tracking application is used to measure utilization which is incorporated to calculate production and column 3, lines 60-61, where there is a production measurement system (36) which is equivalent to determining production rate information as it performs an identical function in substantially the same manner with substantially the same results and column 8, lines 5-9, where in relation to production measurement, product volumes are determined and entered). Morgan is an analogous art as it also teaches about project management and workflow concerning tasks. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the management system of Clarke with the number of subtasks/time feature of Morgan to provide a means of measuring the rate of task performance which can be targeted for reduction to help improve efficiency.

As per claims 7, 28 and 46, Clarke teaches the work volume is calculated (paragraph 85, where the system focuses on improving a combination of maintenance operation volume management and resource management to improve the facility, whereby improving volume management would require knowing the work volume), but does not explicitly teach it per the number of full time employees. Morgan teaches that it is known work volume is calculated as the number of full time employees needed to perform the identified subtasks, based on standard work hours per day (column 8, lines 53-56, where employee expenditures are expressed as full time equivalents (FTE)).

Morgan is an analogous art as it also teaches about project management and workflow

concerning tasks. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to modify the management system of Clarke with the number

of FTE feature of Morgan to provide a means of measuring the manpower required for

tasks which can be targeted for reduction to help improve efficiency.

As per claims 9, 30-31 and 47, Clarke teaches accessing staff information;

determining staff availability based on the staff information; and the staff information is

related to one of: the number of employees, capability of a specific employee to perform

the subtasks, information related to exempt status of employees, information related to

staff outage, information related to work time that cannot be used to perform the

subtasks, and information related to business days within a specific period of time (See

Figure 7, where the employee schedule is displayed. The breaks listed would constitute

time the employee is unavailable to work or perform tasks. This would indicate the

availability of the employee and would require accessing in order to view the

information.). Clarke does not explicitly teach a capacity report. Morgan teaches that it

is known to generate a capacity report based on the work volume and the staff

availability (column 19, lines 35-51: "User-profile Reporting" where the availability of the

employee is reported as well as the production or work volume as indicated by the

Activity Output Report, where output is equivalent to work volume as it performs an

identical function in substantially the same manner with substantially the same results).

Morgan is an analogous art as it also teaches about project management and workflow

concerning tasks. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to modify the management system of Clarke with the capacity report feature of Morgan to provide a means of measuring the manpower required for tasks which can be targeted for reduction to help improve efficiency and optimize resource allocation.

As per claims 10, 32 and 48, Clarke does not explicitly teach information about employees. Morgan teaches that it is known the information related to the number of employees includes at least one of the number of full-time employees, the number of other types of employees, the total hours worked by other types of employees expressed as a full-time employee equivalent (column 17, lines 33-41, where the full-time equivalents (FTE) are reported with respect to each product and its cost. The FTE would indicate the number of employees.); and the other types of employees include at least one of part-time employees, temporary employees, interns, and borrowed staff (column 6, lines 1-2 where employees include contractors, consultants and temporary workers). Morgan is an analogous art as it also teaches about project management and workflow concerning tasks. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the management system of Clarke with the number of FTE feature of Morgan to provide a means of measuring the manpower required for tasks which can be targeted for reduction to help improve efficiency.

As per claims 11, 33 and 49, Clarke teaches the step of calculating extended staff availability by considering extended work hours. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that companies have second shift and sometimes third shifts to extend their staff and the work hours in order to meet production goals. Therefore it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

management database of Clarke with an extended staff and extended hours feature to

provide a means for increasing staff and work hours to meet production requirements.

One such reference that teaches this concept is "The General Employee Scheduling

Problem: An Integration of MS and AI" by Glover et al, Computer & Operations

Research, vol 13, no 5, p. 563-573, 1996.; Clarke does not explicitly teach a capacity

report. Morgan teaches that it is known the capacity report is generated further based

on the extended staff availability (column 19, lines 35-51: "User-profile Reporting" where

the availability of the employee is reported as well as the production or work volume as

indicated by the Activity Output Report, where output is equivalent to work volume as it

performs an identical function in substantially the same manner with substantially the

same results. The extended staff is included in the employees as noted in column 6,

lines 1-2.). Morgan is an analogous art as it also teaches about project management

and workflow concerning tasks. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the management system of Clarke

with the capacity report feature of Morgan to provide a means of measuring the

manpower required for tasks which can be targeted for reduction to help improve

efficiency and optimize resource allocation.

As per claims 12, 34 and 50, Clarke teaches the extended staff availability is

calculated based on a plurality of overtime scenarios or a plurality of expanded staff

scenarios (Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that companies have

second shift and sometimes third shifts, or expanded staff scenarios, to extend their

staff and the work hours in order to meet production goals. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the management database of Clarke with an extended staff and extended hours feature to provide a means for increasing staff and work hours to meet production requirements. One such reference that teaches this concept is "The General Employee Scheduling Problem: An Integration of MS and AI" by Glover et al, Computer & Operations Research, vol 13, no 5, p. 563-573, 1996.).

As per claims 20, 39 and 55, Clarke teaches the staff availability is calculated based on at least one of the number of employees, the information related to staff outage, the information related to the amount of work time that cannot be used to perform the subtasks, the information related to business days, and the amount of defined work hours per day (See Figure 7, where the employee schedule is displayed. The breaks listed would constitute time the employee is unavailable to work or perform tasks. This would indicate the availability of the employee and would require accessing in order to view the information.).

As per claims 21, 40 and 56, Clarke teaches the information related to the amount of work time that cannot be used to perform the subtasks depends on at least one of the position, the identity, the exempt status, the handling capability, and the outage status of the respective employee (See Figure 7, where the employee schedule is displayed. The breaks listed would constitute time the employee is unavailable or outage time with respect to being able to work to perform tasks.)

7.   Claims 4, 8, 25, 29 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Clarke (US 2006/0053043).

As per claims 4, 25 and 44, Clarke does not explicitly teach the time unit is an

hour. Figure 7 indicates breaking the work schedule into periods of time for each day,

which would entail blocks of hours or portions of hours for breaks and work periods.

Official notice is taken that it is old and well known to use an hour when determining a

rate. Miles per hour (mph) being one such common hourly rate. Therefore it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an

hourly rate to provide a user-friendly means of expressing rate.

As per claims 8 and 29, Clarke teaches the standard work hours per day are

configurable. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that the work hours for

employees are a dynamic variable that can change. Some employees work part time,

others full time, some work second shift and others work weekends. Therefore it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize

a configurable work schedule of hours. One such reference that teaches this concept is

"The General Employee Scheduling Problem: An Integration of MS and AI" by Glover et

al, Computer & Operations Research, vol 13, no 5, p. 563-573, 1996.

8.   Claims 13-14, 16-19, 35-36, 38, 51-52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke (US 2006/0053043) in view of Morgan et al

(US 5,799,286) in further view of Thompson (US 7,020,619).

As per claims 13, 35 and 51, Clarke does not explicitly teach comparing work

volume with the staff and then with the extended staff. Thompson teaches that it is

known that the capacity report is generated based on a first comparison between the work volume and the staff availability, and a second comparison between the work volume and the extended staff availability (column 13, lines 31-34, where monitoring productivity allows an operation to compare scheduled workload with the available human resources and column 14, lines 20-21 where the cost effectiveness of outsourcing or using extended staff for work is determined.). Thompson is an analogous art as it also teaches about an activity based management system. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Clarke with the comparison of staff to extended staff feature of Thompson to provide a more detailed analysis of human capital cost.

As per claims 14, 36 and 52, Clarke does not explicitly teach warnings. Thompson teaches that it is known to generate warnings based on the first comparison and the second comparison (column 15, lines 1-40, where the value of the cost-value indicates whether using outsourced or extended staff resources is cost competitive or if the product should be made internally. If the value is negative, costs would be saved by outsourcing the work. This is equivalent to a warning as it performs an identical function in substantially the same manner with substantially the same resutls). Thompson is an analogous art as it also teaches about an activity based management system. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Clarke with the warning feature of Thompson to provide a more user-friendly system that is easy-to-use.

As per claims 16, 38 and 54, Clarke does not explicitly teach calculating work time. Thompson teaches that it is known that the total amount of time that employees can perform the subtasks within the specific period of time is calculated by using the equation of: (the number of employees) · (the number of standard work hours per day) · (the number of business days within the specific period of time) - (the amount of time lost due to staff outage within the specific period of time) - (the amount of work time that cannot be used to perform the subtasks within the specific period of time) (column 3, lines 36-67 and column 4, lines 1-3, where the system determines the start time and cycle and intervals required to complete the tasks for each project). Thompson is an analogous art as it also teaches about an activity based management system. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Clarke with the work time calculation feature of Thompson to provide an efficient means for determining available work time.

As per claim 17, Morgan teaches the capacity report is generated further based on the extended staff availability (column 19, lines 35-51: "User-profile Reporting" where the availability of the employee is reported as well as the production or work volume as indicated by the Activity Output Report, where output is equivalent to work volume as it performs an identical function in substantially the same manner with substantially the same results. The extended staff is included in the employees as noted in column 6, lines 1-2.); the step of calculating extended staff availability by considering extended work hours (column 6, lines 1-5, where each employee, including the extended staff, has their activity percentage data calculated for their respective job. Indicating activity

status would also indicate availability when activity status is zero or no value is indicated. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that companies have second shift and sometimes third shifts, or expanded staff scenarios, to extend their staff and the work hours in order to meet production goals. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the management database of Morgan with an extended staff and extended hours feature to provide a means for increasing staff and work hours to meet production requirements. One such reference that teaches this concept is "The General Employee Scheduling Problem: An Integration of MS and AI" by Glover et al, Computer & Operations Research, vol 13, no 5, p. 563-573, 1996.).

As per claim 18, Morgan teaches the extended staff availability is calculated based on a plurality of overtime scenarios or a plurality of expanded staff scenarios (Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that companies have second shift and sometimes third shifts, or expanded staff scenarios, to extend their staff and the work hours in order to meet production goals. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the management database of Clarke with an extended staff and extended hours feature to provide a means for increasing staff and work hours to meet production requirements. One such reference that teaches this concept is "The General Employee Scheduling Problem: An Integration of MS and AI" by Glover et al, Computer & Operations Research, vol 13, no 5, p. 563-573, 1996.).

As per claim 19, Clarke teaches the capacity report includes a cost analysis (paragraph 66: "FIGS. 9 and 10 are used to create categories of resources in order to define people, skill sets, experience levels, cost, and availability.").

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Sterrett whose telephone number is 571-272-6881. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 10 am to 8 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JGS

4-1-07

JONATHAN G. STERRETT

EXAMINER

AU 3623